ATTACHMENT 34

EXHIBIT 28

From: Jan Vilhuber <vilhuber@cisco.com>
To: Allen Long <along@cisco.com>
CC: aaa-geeks@cisco.com <aaa-geeks@cisco.com>;parser-police@cisco.com <parser-police@cisco.com>
Sent: 10/22/1997 10:07:23 PM
Subject: Re: Change in default Radius behavior

On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Allen Long wrote:
> Yes, I think I could live with:
>
> radius-server authorize ncp
> and no radius-server authorize ncp
>
> If it really is a boolean, why do we need the complexity of the extra
> keyword (permit|deny)?
>
No, I suppose we don't need the added potion,s although the spell out the
intent pretty clearly, without leaving much to be guessed.

Also, I always have my hidden agenda of future extensibility, and adding the
permit deny let's you later add on ...permit ip ipx or deny deccp, and
thinkgs like that.

I wouldn't complain too loudly about leaving them off, though.

jan

> A
>
> On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Jan Vilhuber wrote:
>
> > Hm.. maybe I've been working with the code too long. I think it's perfectly
> > obvious what it means. Run it by Dpeng and those guys... They'll know for
> > sure what customers think.
> >
> > I feel stronly that the suggestion below is the best under the circumstances.
> > Customers, I think, will know what this means. The only confusion I see is
> > that this may be TOO broad, i.e. we're talking only about PPP here, and not
> > exec and things like that. You could call it something like:
> >
> > radius-server authorize-ncp permit|deny
> >
> > But then it might be better (for extensibility) to make it
> >
> > radius-server authorization ncp permit|deny
> >
> > But now we're getting a bit too complicated again, and che will raise an
> > objection.
> >
> > I'll cc aaa-geeks...
> > jan
> >
> > On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Allen Long wrote:
> >
> > > My only concern is that we shouldn't send the user to the manual to find
> > > the meaning of the command. When I see
> > >
> > > radius-server authorization permit
> > >
> > > I don't get the message that, by default, we are letting all services
> > > operate in spite of Radius. 'authorization permit' could mean many, many
> > > things.
> > >
> > > A

```
> > >
> > > On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Jan Vilhuber wrote:
> > >
> > > > I still think the best config line would be:
> > > > radius-server authorization [permit|deny]
> > > >
> > > > You could throw in a 'default' somewhere for future extensability. This
> > > > leaves the command quite extensible, since we add on NCP's to authorization
> > > > as a list after the permit or deny at some future date.
> > > >
> > > > What's your objection to the above?
> > > >
> > > > jan
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Allen Long wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > I think we can't forget about the Green party or the Liberitarians either.
> > > > >
> > > > > Thank you for pointing out that it's authorization. And, yes, I am
> > > > > serious. It's always hard to find a short phrase that is descriptive. This
> > > > > is the best I could think of.
> > > > >
> > > > > A
> > > > >
> > > > > On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Jan Vilhuber wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > On Wed, 22 Oct 1997, Allen Long wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Hey Jan,
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Really, I wasn't trying to be flip. What do you think about something
> > > > > > > like:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > [no] radius authentication liberal
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you think people would take this as a plot by Newt to keep Liberals
> > > > > > > from getting network access? ;)
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > But will you then have a 'conservative' option too? And what about communist?
> > > > > > > We'll have TOO many options.. no can do ;)
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > BTW.. in case you're even halfway serious (I can't tell ;) it really needs to
> > > > > > > be 'authorization', not 'authentication'.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > jan
> > > > > > > --
> > > > > > > Jan Vilhuber vilhuber@cisco.com
> > > > > > > Cisco Systems, San Jose (408) 527-0847
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > --
> > > > Jan Vilhuber vilhuber@cisco.com
> > > > Cisco Systems, San Jose (408) 527-0847
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> >
> > --
> > Jan Vilhuber vilhuber@cisco.com
> > Cisco Systems, San Jose (408) 527-0847
> >
> >
>

--
```

Jan Vilhuber vilhuber@cisco.com
Cisco Systems, San Jose (408) 527-0847